

Co-Chairpersons: Supervisor Michael Mayo
Committee Clerk: Linda Durham, 278-4225
Research Analysts: Glenn Bultman, 278-5276; Bob Murphy, 278-5263

MILWAUKEE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

Thursday, June 26, 2003 - 9:30 A.M.

Milwaukee County Courthouse - Room 201-B

MINUTES

TAPE No. 1: Side A, #001 to 394

PRESENT: Supervisors Nyklewicz, White, Schmitt, Broderick, Mayo (Chair)

EXCUSED: Supervisors Coggs-Jones, Cesarz

Scheduled Items:

1. 03SRR1 Initial meeting of the Committee on Redistricting to discuss the process for developing a redistricting plan for new Supervisory districts to implement Adopted County Board Resolution File No. 03-235, which approved the policy of reducing the size of the County Board to 19 members. Milwaukee County is authorized to consider such action by Assembly Bill 18 which has been adopted by the legislature. **(INFORMATIONAL) (REPORT FROM STAFF)**

Glenn Bultman provided an overview of the process for developing a redistricting plan for new supervisory districts. He advised that he has done redistricting for the County Board several times in the past. Bob Murphy will assist him with this process. Bob Andrews, Deputy Corporation Counsel, who has also worked on redistricting in the past, will again assist with the process regarding legal matters.

Mr. Bultman stated that Assembly Bill 18 is awaiting the Governor's signature. As soon as the Bill is signed, there will be further discussion as to when future meetings of the Redistricting Committee will occur. Mr. Bultman referenced the memo from County Board Chairman Lee Holloway indicating his intent, once a redistricting plan has been developed by staff, to refer the plan to both the Redistricting Committee and to the Finance and Audit Committee. Mr. Bultman advised that after the plan is referred to the Finance and Audit Committee and then forwarded to the County Board, the action would not need suspension of the rules to be considered by the County Board.

Scheduled Items (Continued):

Mr. Bultman reviewed the packet of information he distributed, specifically, the outline of the map of the plan that was previously adopted by the Board. The plan was enacted pursuant to both State Statutes and the Federal Voters Rights Act. The plan was reviewed by the Corporation Counsel. The plan included a list showing the population of each of the districts and the racial percentages. The plan also included a list of all the wards using the new ward numbers and maps. Per the State Statutes, this plan will take affect for the 2004 elections, unless the legislation allowing the Board to reduce its size is signed by the Governor and the Board takes an action to reduce its size. Any plan considered by this committee will be reviewed by staff and Corporation Counsel to ensure that it complies with the State Statutes and Voters Rights Act. Corporation Counsel will provide a report to this committee before any votes are taken.

Bob Andrews reiterated the role of Corporation Counsel in the redistricting process. He advised that there have been no significant court decisions since 2001 when the County Board last acted to redistrict.

Mr. Chacon from the Governor's (Milwaukee) office and a member of the Hispanic Redistricting Committee, requested 2004 maps voted upon by the Board for the new wards.

Board members requested that Mr. Chacon express their concerns to the Governor relative to having the pending legislation reviewed as soon as possible. Mr. Chacon indicated that he will call the Chairman of this committee to advise of the Governor's timetable.

Mr. Bultman advised that Senate Amendment 1 to Assembly Bill 18 (which was included in the adopted Bill) states that if the new redistricting plan to reduce the size of the County Board is not enacted before November 15, 2003, it would not take effect for the 2004 election. It would take effect for the next regular election in April, 2008.

Mr. Bultman talked about staffing of this committee. Mr. Bultman or Mr. Murphy will meet with the 25 County Board members to discuss their districts and any other concerns they may have on redistricting and report back to both the Chairman of the Board and the Chairman of this committee. After the Bill is signed by the Governor, the second meeting is likely to be a public hearing, and it would also be a meeting to discuss different plans that would be presented (if there are more than one) and any amendments that would be considered. The meeting may be scheduled for both the afternoon and early evening. It is not anticipated that the second meeting would involve any votes. The primary purpose of the meeting would be to provide information to all Board members, so that everyone has the same information.

Scheduled Items (Continued):

Staff will assist County Board Supervisors with drafting any plans or amendments requested. Kitty Shekoski will have access to printing any maps requested. Everything that is prepared for members of this committee will be given to all 25 County Board Supervisors. Mr. Bultman advised that he will forward a memo to Supervisors giving them his cell phone number so that they can contact him during the redistricting process.

Chairman Mayo requested that Mr. Bultman provide a summary of this meeting to all 25 County Board Supervisors so that they know exactly what the Committee is attempting to do.

This meeting was recorded on tape, which is available for audit upon prior request of the Committee Clerk. Any written documents submitted may be reviewed upon request of the Committee Clerk. The official copy of these minutes is available in the County Board office.

Adjourned: 10:00 a.m.

Linda Durham

Linda Durham, Committee Clerk

Co-Chairpersons: Supervisor Michael Mayo
Committee Clerk: Linda Durham, 278-4225
Research Analysts: Glenn Bultman, 278-5276; Bob Murphy, 278-5263

MILWAUKEE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

Thursday, August 7, 2003 – 5:00 P.M.

Milwaukee County Courthouse - Room 203-R

M I N U T E S

TAPE No. 1: Side A, #403 to End of Tape
TAPE No. 1: Side B, #001 to 196

PRESENT: Supervisors Nyklewicz, White, Schmitt, Cesarz, Broderick, Mayo (Chair)

EXCUSED: Supervisors Coggs-Jones

Scheduled Items:

1. 03R2 Review of Wisconsin Act 32 (2003) relating to the size of the County Board in populous counties and adopted County Board Resolution File No. 03-235 which approved the policy of reducing the size of the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors to 19 members, effective with the beginning of the 2004 term of the County Board.

Glenn Bultman indicated that the Statute has been signed by the Governor and has taken affect. The Statute allows the County Board to do redistricting once before the next census. If redistricting is done this term, it would not be able to be done again until after the next census.

Supervisor Cesarz expressed concern relative to the timeline of the redistricting plan. He asked when the plan should be completed in order to have it go into effect before the next election in April. Supervisor Nyklewicz stated that the redistricting plan should be completed no later than November 13, 2003. Mr. Bultman advised that the redistricting plan would have to be published as an ordinance prior to November 13, 2003.

Scheduled Items (Continued):

2. 03R3 Public Hearing to receive comments relating to redistricting.

Oscar R. Cervera, Director for the Federation for Civic Action asked when the actual maps of the redistricting plan would be available. Chairman Mayo advised that the maps would be available by the next Redistricting meeting (August 25, 2003). Mr. Cervera also asked if the maps were drafted. He indicated that he wants to ensure that the Hispanic community will have the opportunity to elect a County Supervisor. Chairman Mayo advised that there are no drafts of all the districts available at this time. However, it is one of the goals of the County Board of Supervisors and also contained within the resolution that there be a Hispanic district.

Robert Miranda, representing Walkers Point Green Party and the Greater Milwaukee Green Party, indicated that they would like to go on record, as a party, opposing the whole idea of reducing the County Board. He stated that he wants to ensure that they are heard as a party, that any time elected officials go along with the idea of reducing participatory democratic ideals, it goes against the whole notion of a democratic society. Mr. Miranda advised that the Greater Milwaukee Green Party wants to go on record indicating that they will support all efforts to ensure that communities of color do not suffer from this reduction of the County Board. The Greater Milwaukee Green Party will be very vocal and very active during the redistricting process to assure that communities of colors are not adversely affected.

Larry Dupuis, Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) Wisconsin Foundation, indicated that the major concern in the community with the reduction in the number of County Supervisors is dilution of representation of minorities. Mr. Dupuis advised that in going from 25 County Supervisors to 19, the ACLU did a preliminary assessment of some potential maps that focused on one of the south side districts (district 12). It didn't appear to the ACLU that there was an obvious way to draw that district in a way that maintained a sufficient effective Latino majority in the district. The case law in the 7th circuit on the Voting Rights Act in this kind of a setting suggests that you need to have roughly between 60 and 75% total population Latino in order to have an effective majority. Mr. Dupuis stated that because the ACLU has not seen any maps at this point, it is hard for them to make a judgement as to whether or not the redistricting proposal will comply with the Voting Rights Act as it's currently being interpreted by the courts.

With regard to African American representation, there is also a risk. However, the risk isn't quite as dramatic, in that there is only one Latino district right now.

Scheduled Items (Continued):

Mr. Dupuis indicated that it is very important that the public be informed as early as possible of the proposals that are on the table in terms of where the lines will be drawn. At this point, it is very hard for the public to know if there will be a problem because they have not seen any maps.

Mr. Dupuis advised that the Supreme Court's recent decision in the University of Michigan cases made it abundantly clear that race still does matter in this country. Mr. Dupuis indicated that race matters very much in the Milwaukee community and we have to be very careful to make sure that it is apparent to the public that people of color have access to express themselves through the political process.

Supervisor Cesarz requested that Mr. Dupuis provide his personal opinion of the definition of a minority majority district and whether or not it has to be just one protected classification or if it could be some combination of the various protected classes.

Mr. Dupuis indicated that he really couldn't answer the question personally, but he could say from his experience growing up in the Milwaukee community, that it is a very racially polarized community.

Supervisor Broderick indicated that in the packet of materials that committee members were provided, the term, "communities of interests" is raised as one of the criteria for traditional redistricting principals. His assumption, is that minority groups may not necessarily share a community of interest and therefore might not be able to be amalgamated.

Mr. Dupuis advised that again, based on his personal experience, growing up in the Milwaukee community, that there are distinct communities of interest. He indicated that the African American community and the Latino community aren't always together on political issues. However, there are some political issues where they are, but that holds true of African Americans and the White community, Southeast Asian community or any ethnic group.

3. 03R4 Report from Corporation Counsel concerning two questions which affect the drafting of redistricting plans: 1) the allowable deviation permitted for redistricting when districts must be created using whole wards; and 2) whether the definition of "contiguous" contained in Wisconsin Statutes 59.10 (3)(b)3 applies to Milwaukee County.

William J. Domina, Milwaukee County Corporation Counsel, indicated that he prepared the written opinion and would entertain any questions. He referred to the U.S. Supreme Court in Brown v. Thompson, 462 U.S.835, (842) 77 L.Ed

Scheduled Items (Continued):

2d 214, 103 S.Ct. 2690 (1983) language (copy of legal opinion attached to the original of these minutes). Mr. Domina opined that the courts would allow a similar minor deviation of up to 10% when there is a county-wide redistricting. Mr. Domina advised that "Yes" the definition of "contiguous" contained in Section 59.10(3)(b), Wis. Stats. does apply to Milwaukee County. He opined that the territory in a supervisor district that is connected solely at a street intersection would be "contiguous" as the territory is touching corner to corner.

4. 03R5 Report from County Board staff relating to the issues which must be considered in all redistricting plans because of the Voters Rights Act 42 U.S.C. #1973 as explained in the report from Percy L. Julian, Jr. dated May 11, 2001 that was provided to the Milwaukee County Redistricting Committee in 2001.

Glenn Bultman advised that it is County Board staff's intention to provide any plans that are submitted to the committee for the next meeting to Corporation Counsel in advance with the data attached to it for review so that Corporation Counsel will be prepared to answer any legal questions that may arise in the future.

Mr. Bultman provided an overview of the Percy L. Julian report (copy attached to the original of these minutes).

Supervisor Schmitt advised of his support to reduce the size of the County Board of Supervisors from 25 to 19. He indicated that he was comfortable with 19 Supervisors in that it pretty much guarantees a Hispanic district. He also indicated that he is sensitive to the need for a Hispanic district of influence.

Mr. Bultman indicated that 10% is a little misleading. He would prefer to refer to it as plus or minus 5%. That means that it might be 5% under or 5% over.

There was some discussion about wards. Chairman Mayo advised that most wards are between 1,000 and 3,400 people.

Supervisor Cesarz requested that Mr. Bultman summarize principles that are used in redistricting. He indicated that after reviewing materials, talking with constituents and colleagues, he came up with four principles. He indicated that he hoped Mr. Bultman could point out to him whether or not the four principles he shares are included. He further indicated that it would be a benefit to himself, perhaps to his colleagues on this committee, as well as to the public, if everyone was informed as to the summary of what the principles are. Supervisor Cesarz shared the following principles:

Scheduled Items (Continued):

1. Boundaries should be drawn in such a way as it was said in the documents to keep municipalities, neighborhoods and communities of interest together to the greatest extent possible.
2. Districts should be defined in such a manner as to ensure appropriate representation of protected minority populations.
3. Districts should be defined without regard to the residents of incumbents. (He believes strongly that redistricting should be done this way because it means that incumbent protection is not a major goal of redistricting.)
4. Districts should be defined without regard to any issue advocacy (just because there is a "hot issue" in a particular part of the community – whether it's a large part or one area of the community, you shouldn't try to create a district that is just going to favor successful conclusion of that particular issue).

Supervisor Cesarz believes that the above principles are a broad set of principles that would help ensure a fair and equitable redrawing of legislative districts.

Mr. Bultman advised that he will provide a memo that will summarize both issues that were listed in the opinion from Julian L. Percy, as well as the ones in the State Statutes and those that have been used in the past. Mr. Bultman further advised that regarding the issue relating to incumbents, on page 31 of the Percy opinion, it states that "protection of incumbency is a legitimate issue for a political body to consider". Therefore, Mr. Bultman indicated that it is not an inappropriate thing to consider nor is it the only thing to consider.

Chairman Mayo requested that Mr. Bultman provide a summary of the principles used in redistricting and distribute to all 25 County Supervisors when completed.

Supervisor Cesarz asked if it was possible to request that two maps be drawn, one without regard to where the residents of the incumbent would be.

Mr. Bultman indicated that he will be happy to draw the maps, however, the supervisor requesting the map would have to sit down at the computer with him to help make the decisions as to how the maps are drawn. The author of the map should make the decision as to how they would differ. Staff will use their experience and the information discussed to assist.

Chairman Mayo requested that Mr. Bultman provide the history of how Milwaukee County and other state and federal entities have conducted

Scheduled Items (Continued):

redistricting plans in the past.

Robert Miranda expressed concern as to the statement that Supervisor Cesarz made relative to a protected population. He is curious as to Supervisor's Cesarz's definition of a protected population. Mr. Miranda stated that government's responsibility shouldn't be to be protecting, it should be to ensure that it establishes measures, mechanisms or whatever policies it needs to ensure that in a democracy we can be as diverse and reflective of the population. Mr. Miranda indicated that he doesn't understand how protected population fits into ensuring that a population in our society takes part in this democracy.

Supervisor Cesarz indicated that when he used the words previously in reference to minority populations, he was trying to say that as a Caucasian, it is his understanding, that that is the one nonprotected category in the discussions and as such, it is perfectly legitimate to discriminate against and take districts and space from that group in order to assure and insure representation and participation from the other protected classes. Supervisor Cesarz offered to meet with Mr. Miranda after the meeting. Mr. Miranda accepted his offer.

The next Redistricting meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 25, 2003 at 10:00 a.m. in room 203-R.

This meeting was recorded on tape, which is available for audit upon prior request of the Committee Clerk. Any written documents submitted may be reviewed upon request of the Committee Clerk. The official copy of these minutes is available in the County Board office.

Adjourned: 6:00 p.m.

Linda

Linda Durham, Committee Clerk

Co-Chairpersons: Supervisor Michael Mayo
Committee Clerk: Linda Durham, 278-4225
Research Analysts: Glenn Bultman, 278-5276; Bob Murphy, 278-5263

MILWAUKEE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

Monday, August 25, 2003-10:00 A.M.

Milwaukee County Courthouse - Room 203-R

M I N U T E S

TAPE No. 1: Side B, # 201 to End of Tape
TAPE No. 2: Side A, #001 to End of Tape
TAPE No. 2: Side B, #001 to 100

PRESENT: Supervisors Nyklewicz, Coggs-Jones, White, Schmitt, Cesarz, Broderick, Mayo
(Chair)

Scheduled Items:

1. 03R6 Report from County Board Staff with a draft proposed Redistricting Plan for 19 Supervisory Districts. The policy of reducing the size of the County Board to 19 Districts was adopted by the County Board on April 17, 2003 – File No. 03-235. County Board Staff will also provide redistricting data on any amendment(s) or alternative plan(s).

Chairman Mayo indicated that any alternative redistricting plans should be submitted to the Committee Clerk by 4:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. He advised that there will be a special Redistricting meeting scheduled for the latter part of next week. The plans will be voted upon at that time.

Glenn Bultman distributed the County Board staff proposal for 19 districts. It included a map of Milwaukee County with individual district maps and population data. Mr. Bultman advised that it retains the current district number that maintains a majority of the new district for purposes of identification only. Staff recommends that the final district numbers be decided at a different date, after the committee makes a recommendation on a plan. Staff also recommends that when the Redistricting Committee makes a recommendation on any plan, that the plan be referred to Corporation Counsel for a written opinion on the legality of the plan prior to any vote by the County Board.

Scheduled Items (Continued):

Supervisor Nyklewicz stated that it is a good idea to have the opinion of the Corporation Counsel with regard to the staff plan and any others that might come forward as to the legality of those plans prior to a vote by the committee.

Chairman Mayo reiterated that all plans should be submitted to staff. Staff will submit the plan(s) to Corporation Counsel.

Supervisor Borkowski expressed concerns relative to the timing of everything. He asked when the full County Board will vote on any plans. Chairman Mayo indicated he anticipates the full County Board will vote in September or October.

Supervisor Diliberti asked if a two-thirds vote is required by the County Board and if this will be a "From the Committee" or "By the Committee" item. Chairman Mayo indicated that the plan voted upon will need a majority vote and will be "From the Committee".

Jose Olivieri requested that the Committee vote against the plan as it is proposed today. He addressed the issue of the Hispanic community and how the Hispanic community is dealt with within the proposed plan. Mr. Olivieri referred to district 12 and the attempt to create a super majority district. He indicated that he believes that more can be done to enhance that district. He expressed interest relative to the Hispanic community and its significant growth to the West and Southwest of district 12. Mr. Olivieri indicated that he believes that it would be very feasible to have a plan that would allow for a second district that has a substantial Hispanic presence and a growing Hispanic presence. He indicated that the Hispanic community would like to be very involved in the process of formulating a plan. He requested that the Committee come up with a plan that more properly addresses the interests of the Hispanic community.

Ramona Puentes, representative of the Hispanic community, asked for an explanation of when and how the lines on the map regarding the Hispanic community were drawn. Glenn Bultman provided the information requested. Ms. Fuentes indicated that she does not believe that the plan is fair to the Hispanic community.

Hector Colon, Associate Director, United Community Center, indicated that he was very involved in the Latino Redistricting Committee back in 2000. The Latino Redistricting Committee felt that the plan that was approved at that time was a fair plan. The district that was created at that time was Latino majority and an influence district. Mr. Colon expressed concern relative to the newly created 12th district in the proposed plan. He indicated that there is less than

Scheduled Items (Continued):

50% voting age for Latinos and the influence district is diminished significantly. He believes that now there will be a lack of representation among the Hispanic community. He asked that the Latino community be represented fairly.

Glenn Bultman advised that the 50% voting age number that Mr. Colon mentioned was incorrect. The correct Hispanic voting age number is 60.42%.

Supervisor Diliberti indicated that the last plan was vetoed because the Hispanic influence district was not created. He indicated that if a Hispanic influence district is not created, it won't be there for the next 20 years. He stated that there really is no Hispanic influence district in the proposed plan. Supervisor Diliberti indicated that he believes that the Hispanic community feels excluded and a sense of betrayal because the Hispanic influence district was not included in the proposed plan.

Supervisor Weishan echoed some of the comments made earlier relative to redistricting. He indicated that he believes that the proposed plan by staff tried to accommodate many different viewpoints. Supervisor Weishan developed and submitted a plan that addresses some of the issues discussed at this meeting. He believes his plan is a stepping stone in the right direction in the redistricting process and moves forward vs. moving backwards.

Supervisor DeBruin indicated that the proposed plan developed by staff became available last Wednesday. She indicated that most members of the County Board first saw the proposed plan on Wednesday. She stated that two days notice to review the plan and then to try and work on an alternative plan before this meeting put the Supervisors in a "crunched" position. Supervisor DeBruin indicated that the public became aware of the plan just this morning. She indicated that she spoke with several upset constituents prior to this meeting.

Supervisor DeBruin requested that Corporation Counsel provide an understanding or make a recommendation as to whether or not the members of the Board wishing to create alternative plans can be legally forced to submit them by 4:00 p.m. tomorrow, given that an agenda for the next meeting has not yet been developed. Supervisor DeBruin indicated that she would hate for any alternative maps to not be considered because they weren't submitted by the deadline. She indicated that she will try to submit the plan she is developing by the deadline; however, it will be difficult, considering the short time frame in which to do so. She indicated that everyone is welcome to take a look at the map she is working on.

Bob Andrews, Deputy Corporation Counsel, advised that the majority of the voting members of the Redistricting Committee are in control of the agenda

Scheduled Items (Continued):

and what items are going to be presented. In the absence of a vote, the chairman of the Redistricting Committee would make the determination. Supervisor DeBruin asked Mr. Andrews if his answer related to the timing or to the next meeting agenda. She indicated that she was asking about the timing of plans. Mr. Andrews advised that if the majority of the members voting on the matter agree to accept the plans at a later time, this could be done, otherwise the deadline date Chairman Mayo stated stands.

Supervisor DeBruin then requested that Chairman Mayo consider extending the deadline to supervisors who are putting together alternative plans because the deadline given to them is a stricter deadline than the one that was given to staff to create the current proposed plan. Supervisor DeBruin indicated that she would appreciate an understanding from this committee because developing maps is a very laborious, difficult process and it is dependent on staff availability.

Supervisor Nyklewicz asked Mr. Bultman if he considered the Hispanic influence district that had been drawn previously when he drew up the current proposed plan.

Mr. Bultman advised that staff did not take into consideration a Hispanic influence district because 11,000 people from the 8th district which was the Hispanic influence district, were added to the 12th district. Staff did not attempt to maximize the Hispanic population in the 4th district. The 4th district has the highest population of Hispanics after the 12th district.

Supervisor Nyklewicz mentioned that there were those that advocated for an even smaller County Board. He asked how a smaller Board might affect Hispanic representation if that had been approved or if it is resurrected in the future.

Mr. Bultman indicated that it would be problematic to even draw one Hispanic district with an effective voting majority if a smaller County Board was considered.

Supervisor Cesarz commented that Mr. Bultman's answer is an analysis and opinion based on static data. He indicated that we live in a growing community and changing demographics. In the future, population changes might afford a different result. It may be legitimate to look at a different County Board size at a later date, larger or smaller.

Supervisor Nyklewicz indicated that he is not advocating for a smaller County Board, but raised the point because there were those that did. He indicated that he believes a smaller Board would have an adverse impact in terms of the

Scheduled Items (Continued):

legality of developing a plan. A smaller Board would also diminish the representation of the Hispanic community. He advised that some of the individuals that advocated for a smaller Board are now positioning themselves in championing a cause that portrays to be representative of the Hispanic community, when in fact, they also supported the position for 17 County Board districts.

Peggy West, resident of the 12th district, advised that she has worked very closely with the Latino Redistricting Committee. Ms. West advised that she believes that the 12th district is fairly represented in the proposed plan. When the Latino Redistricting Committee made recommendations regarding the proposed plan, they requested that it be 64% Hispanic, which it is, and that it spread out to the South and Southwest, which it does. It also mirrors the aldermanic district which makes it a little less confusing to the residents in the 12th district. There is 60.4% voter age in the 12th district, as indicated on the proposed plan; however, there is still an issue with an influence district.

Ms. West indicated that there are two issues that she would like for the Redistricting Committee to consider before approving a plan. 1) The Hispanic community is very young and a lot of that representation is under the age of 18. Since the proposed plan is supposed to be effective for the next ten years, by the time the next redistricting comes up, there will be an issue of a lot more Hispanics not being properly represented. 2) When a Hispanic influence district is considered, the district should be placed where a Hispanic candidate can have a fair chance when it comes to voters. Ms. West pointed out that just because there is 60.4% on paper doesn't necessarily mean that 60.4% will vote. There is a large representation of individuals that are counted because the census counts them, even if they are here illegally, but they are not able to vote.

Supervisor Schmitt made comments regarding his support to reduce the size of the County Board to 19 members. He indicated that an important qualifying factor was that there would be a Hispanic district of 60% plus.

Supervisor T. Johnson made some observations regarding the map. He indicated that the map, as currently drawn, is favorable to him, since he will maintain a large percent of his original district and does not have another incumbent supervisor to run against. However, Supervisor Johnson indicated that he has some grave concerns as to what he would label as "suspicious targeting" of particular individuals from one political cluster, perhaps for overtly political purposes. He indicated that the three individuals most severely impacted by the current map are Supervisors DeBruin, Diliberti and Krug. He further indicated that two of these three individuals have had their districts totally eliminated, with the latter supervisory district losing half of its

Scheduled Items (Continued):

initial constituency.

Supervisor T. Johnson stated that what is disturbing to him is that Supervisors DeBruin, Diliberti and Krug voted against Chairman Holloway in the last two previous Chairman races. They were and continue to be viable and legitimate challengers to the position of County Board Chairman. He noted that none of the new reformers were targeted or any of the members of the Black Caucus.

Supervisor T. Johnson requested that somehow the map be drawn so that each of the major political clusters representative on the Board incur equal degrees of suffering in this process instead of targeting three people from one political cluster. He indicated that he will analyze other maps as they surface with the same critical eye.

Glenn Bultman provided an explanation as to why and how districts were divided up. Mr. Bultman indicated that there are probably different interpretations that can be made relative to constructing the proposed plan. He stated that he would respect the criticism of anybody that might criticize the plan; however, the plan did not target any one of the County Supervisors.

Supervisor Clark commented on the drawing of the map. She indicated that the 2nd district on the proposed map is not one half of her old district, but instead one fourth of her old district.

Dale Radke from district 2 requested that some consideration be made so that from N. 67th street to N. 60th street, from Capitol Dr. to Melvin street can be reconsidered to be part of district 7. He said according to the proposed plan, constituents would have to deal with two County Supervisors as opposed to one.

Dick Bolander, Mayor of Oak Creek, expressed concern that the city of Oak Creek will have three Supervisors. He requested that the Committee reconsider a different set of lines when it comes to the city of Oak Creek.

Carol Grundy, citizen of Oak Creek, expressed her concern regarding the city of Oak Creek being divided into three districts and having three Supervisors.

Dimity Grabowski, Alderwoman for the 5th District in Oak Creek, also expressed concern about the city of Oak Creek being divided in three districts.

Beverly Buretta, City Clerk for the City of Oak Creek, requested that the Committee reconsider splitting the Oak Creek community into three areas due to commonality of interests. Ms. Buretta also requested that she or the City of Oak Creek be placed on the mailing list to receive agendas, notices, etc.

Scheduled Items (Continued):

regarding meetings pertaining to the Redistricting process. Ms. Buretta indicated that asking individuals to submit an alternative plan by 4:00 p.m. tomorrow would be very difficult for anybody to do.

Supervisor Cesarz indicated that he is also working on a map.

Supervisor Nyklewicz indicated that he believes the proposed plan can be tweaked and he is willing to work with and listen to amendments and/or modifications, but he resents the suggestion that staff was politically motivated in designing the plan. However, Supervisor Nyklewicz indicated that there are other agendas that are being pursued politically and that includes some of the maps that are now being devised. He indicated that he has known Glenn Bultman for a long time and thinks he has a high degree of integrity and commitment to this County.

MOTION BY: (NYKLEWICZ) Lay over, refer to County Board staff the testimony received to date and subsequent testimony so that they might have an opportunity to absorb and reflect the information in refining a plan for consideration by the committee; and that the current proposed plan and any other plans submitted also be submitted to the Corporation Counsel for a legal review and opinion as to their legality. **(Vote 7-0)**

AYES: Nyklewicz, Coggs-Jones, White, Schmitt, Cesarz, Broderick, and Mayo (Chair) -7

NOES: 0

Supervisor Cesarz commented to Chairman Mayo that his reason for pursuing a separate map is because he received personal contact from Chairman Holloway regarding the four principles he shared with the committee at the last meeting. Supervisor Cesarz stated that there is no hidden political agenda. He indicated that it is at the request of Chairman Holloway that he pursue the principles that he shared with this committee, members of the Board, as well as staff.

Supervisor Broderick echoed comments made by Supervisor Nyklewicz regarding the integrity of Mr. Bultman in the redistricting process. He stated that to look for shadowy motives does a disservice to all involved. He indicated that he voted to oppose reducing the number of Board members because he was concerned about minority representation and how it might be diminished. He further indicated that he is now hearing objections from a number of supervisors who voted for reducing the size the Board, but are unhappy with the solution that has been drafted by Mr. Bultman.

Scheduled Items (Continued):

2. 03R7 Public Hearing to receive comments relating to redistricting.

Supervisor DeBruin commented that she doesn't believe or interpret Supervisor Johnson's comments to have any reflection on Mr. Bultman. She indicated that Mr. Bultman is a staff person and he does as he is instructed. If he is instructed to prepare a map that meets criteria, whether it be the legal public criteria, the wishes of the County Board Chairman or members of this committee, he will do so. Supervisor DeBruin stated that the issue is not about Mr. Bultman's integrity. The issue is that there are multiple motivations in preparing separate maps.

Larry DePuis, Legal Director of the ACLU of Wisconsin, stated that he hopes there is an attempt to not rush this process and that time is taken to consider it intelligently, cautiously and that the process is done in the best interest of all communities.

Supervisor White addressed the comments made relative to the redistricting process moving too fast. He stated that the action that the County Board took to request of the State permission to reduce the Board to 19 members before 2010 was very public information. The second phase, which was to wait to see if the Governor signed the legislation, was also made public. Supervisor White advised that the Chairman of this committee acted prior to the Governor's signature by indicating what the redistricting process would be. Therefore, Supervisor White believes it is unfair to characterize the redistricting process as disrespectful and rushed.

Supervisor White stated that the issue of a Hispanic influence district emerged with the 2000 process on a 25-district plan. He made comments as to why the 2000 redistricting plan was vetoed. He indicated that the plan was discriminatory in at least three instances and it was not a fair and balanced plan. He explained that representatives from the Latino Redistricting Committee and representatives from the African American Coalition for Empowerment filed a challenge to Milwaukee County's map and subsequently, the Board adopted a plan that ended up being the fairest and the most balanced.

Supervisor White stated that he believes that the call for a Hispanic influence district proposes a very significant challenge to the current plan that has been presented. By 2008 (with a probability for 2012), there was a possibility that there would be nine minority seats on a 25 member County Board. The current plan proposes approximately seven minority districts out of a 19 member County Board. Supervisor White indicated that he believes the pursuit of an additional Hispanic influence district would require the shift of some population from the 12th district. He indicated that 60.42% of the Hispanic voting age in district 12 is barely at comfort level. He asked if wards would be taken from

Scheduled Items (Continued):

district 12 and added elsewhere to create a Hispanic influence district. Supervisor White requested that Glenn Bultman address this issue.

Mr. Bultman advised that he would not feel comfortable recommending any number below the 64% for the 12th district. He advised that the total population in district 12 is only 23% White and 29% White using voting age percentage. This is more than two to one Hispanic to White. All of the wards in this area have about the same voter participation experience. They have Asians and African Americans, as well as Whites and Hispanics in those voting areas. The White population (23%) does not have high voter participation. Mr. Bultman advised that he would not recommend that any of the Hispanic population be taken from the 12th district to create an influence district.

Supervisor White stated that he wanted to challenge the notion that the great injustice of the proposed plan is the absence of a very specific Hispanic influence district.

Supervisor Diliberti addressed previous comments made regarding the proposed plan and some of the history behind creating a Hispanic influence district. He stated that what concerns him about the Hispanic district in the current proposed plan is that it was not created to maximize the Hispanic votes. He believes the percentage of Hispanic votes can be increased. Supervisor Diliberti stated that it is important that the County Board look at the redistricting process with integrity because the public is watching. It is not "business as usual".

Supervisor White asked staff if there would be some determination of what the total minority population would be to constitute an influence district. Chairman Mayo stated that when staff prepares the above information, it should be shared with this committee, as well as County Board staff.

Supervisor White stated that because representatives from Oak Creek were present at this meeting and expressed their concerns relative to their community being divided in three parts, he would like to have staff prepare a report showing each of the 19 municipalities in Milwaukee County, identifying the number of communities represented by multiple supervisors in the previous redistricting plan and in the current proposed plan.

Glenn Bultman stated that he and Bob Murphy are available as staff for this committee and any County Board member during this process. The phone number in the computer room that Mr. Bultman is utilizing is 278-2025.

The next Redistricting meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 4, 2003 at 10:00 a.m. in room 203-R.

Scheduled Items (Continued):

This meeting was recorded on tape, which is available for audit upon prior request of the Committee Clerk. Any written documents submitted may be reviewed upon request of the Committee Clerk. The official copy of these minutes is available in the County Board office.

Linda

Linda Durham, Committee Clerk

Chairperson: Supervisor Michael Mayo
Committee Clerk: Linda Durham, 278-4225
Research Analysts: Glenn Bultman, 278-5276; Bob Murphy, 278-5263

MILWAUKEE COUNTY COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

Thursday, September 4, 2003-10:00 A.M.

Milwaukee County Courthouse - Room 203-R

M I N U T E S

TAPE No. 2: Side B, # 119 to End of Tape
TAPE No. 3: Side A, #001 to End of Tape
TAPE No. 3: Side B, #001 to 470

PRESENT: Supervisors Nyklewicz, Coggs-Jones, White, Schmitt, Cesarz, Broderick, Mayo
(Chair)

Scheduled Items:

1. 03R8 Consideration of proposed Redistricting Plans for 19 Supervisory Districts. The policy of reducing the size of the County Board to 19 Districts was adopted by the County Board on April 17, 2003 – File No. 03-235. (County Board Staff will provide redistricting data on the plans submitted.)

Chairman Mayo advised that every plan submitted to the Redistricting Committee would be discussed and voted upon at today's meeting.

A. Draft staff plan

Glenn Bultman stated that the redistricting plan drafted by staff has been revised (copy attached to the original of these minutes). He advised that the first major change in the plan is that district 4 is now a Hispanic influence district. District 4 is 36.92% Hispanic and 50.83% White which means that it is over 49% minority. The percentage for the Hispanic super majority district is still over 64% (64.06%) and over 60% voting age. Mr. Bultman explained that in order to make the 4th district a Hispanic influence district, all of the north side of the 4th district has been deleted and added to other districts. The 4th district is now entirely on the south side of Milwaukee, which is where the Hispanic population is most concentrated.

Scheduled Items (Continued):

The second major change in the plan recommends that the majority of Oak Creek be included in district 23. Sixteen of the 18 wards of Oak Creek are in district 23. All of Hales Corners is in district 23 and the substantial portion of the part of Franklin that was previously in district 23 remains in that district.

Supervisor Cesarz requested that staff comment on the number of African American majority districts and the percentages associated with each of those districts in the revised plan.

Mr. Bultman stated that the revised plan has six African American majority districts. This plan continues to have the second district made up of about half of the previous 2nd district and about half of the previous 9th district. That district, using voting age data, does have a majority of African Americans of 58% and is 34.88% White.

Robert Miranda, representing the Milwaukee Green Party, commented on the staff plan. He indicated that he believes the revised staff plan is the best plan out of all of the plans presented and that it honors and respects the Latino community's wishes. Mr. Miranda requested that the County Board support the staff plan because it ensures that people of color in Milwaukee County are not going to be disenfranchised.

Ramona Puentes, representative of the Hispanic community, commented that she is overwhelmingly satisfied with the revised staff plan and that she believes the plan is fair.

Gerald Glazer spoke in opposition to the staff plan. He indicated that many of the districts on the staff map have weird elongated shapes and wind around one another.

Supervisor Weishan requested clarification about the redistricting process. He stated that because the staff plan was created yesterday afternoon, none of the Board had the opportunity to see it until this morning. He indicated that he does not feel that it is appropriate to vote on the plan today.

Supervisor DeBruin spoke relative to the revised staff plan. She indicated that there has not been enough time to review it. Supervisor DeBruin provided an amendment to the staff plan (copy attached to the original of these minutes).

B. Proposed amendment by Supervisor Krug to staff plan

Glenn Bultman stated that Supervisor Krug's amendment only affects the first and second district. It adds some wards from the city of Glendale to the second district and it takes out some wards of the second district in the city of Milwaukee and adds them to the first district. Population data was distributed

Scheduled Items (Continued):

(copy attached to the original of these minutes).

MOTION BY: (CESARZ) Place amendment on file **(Vote 6-1)**

AYES: Coggs-Jones, White, Schmitt, Cesarz, Broderick, Mayo (Chair) - 6

NOES: Nyklewicz - 1

C. Supervisor Weishan's proposed plan for 19 districts

Supervisor Weishan presented the map that he developed (copy attached to the original of these minutes). He stated that there is a spirit of commonality throughout his plan. He indicated that he worked very hard to create a Hispanic district and a Hispanic influence district.

D. Supervisor DeBruin's proposed plan for 19 districts

Supervisor DeBruin presented the map that she developed. She advised that her map takes into account, to some extent, incumbency and the wishes of elected officials. She indicated that there are five African American majority districts in this plan and an African American influence district.

Supervisor DeBruin withdrew the map that she presented.

E. Supervisor Cesarz's proposed plan for 19 districts

Supervisor Cesarz presented the map that he developed (copy attached to the original of these minutes). He reviewed the four principles that he shared at a prior meeting. He indicated that he developed his plan based upon those four principles. There are six African American districts and one Hispanic district in the map he developed.

Arden Degner, Chairman of the South Shore Republican Club and resident of Oak Creek, made comments relative to the city of Oak Creek being split up. He asked that the committee give serious consideration to keeping the city of Oak Creek in a separate district from the communities of South Milwaukee and Cudahy.

Oscar Cervera, Federation for Civic Action, stated that he is not happy with the reduction of County Supervisors; however, the Latino group is pleased with the staff plan with some minor cosmetic changes.

Carol Grundy, resident of Oak Creek, indicated that she believes the Board being reduced is a positive sign for the county. However, she stated that she would prefer that the City of Oak Creek not be divided up.

Vincent Knox, Committee on Voting Rights, spoke out against the staff plan. He stated that he believes that the plan goes against the principle of what he

Scheduled Items (Continued):

calls "representative democracy". He indicated that he does not agree with downsizing the County Board.

MOTION BY: (COGGS-JONES) Approve the staff plan with a referral to Corporation Counsel for a written opinion as to the legality of this plan.

(Vote: 6-1)

AYES: Nyklewicz, Coggs-Jones, White, Schmitt, Broderick, Mayo (Chair) - 6

NOES: Cesarz - 1

Supervisor Nyklewicz asked Mr. Bultman if he had the opportunity to discuss the revised plan with Corporation Counsel as to the legality of the plan.

Mr. Bultman stated that he had not spoken with Corporation Counsel relative to the legality of the staff plan.

Chairman Mayo requested that Glenn Bultman explain where the redistricting process is going from this point and how the Board will proceed.

Mr. Bultman explained that, according to the letter that came from the County Board Chair, he requested that any recommendation from this committee be referred to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee would meet most likely the same day the Board would consider any plans that would be forwarded. At this time, the date has not yet been established. Sufficient time will be allowed for the Corporation Counsel to write an opinion and to distribute documents to County Board members. After the Finance Committee makes a recommendation, they would have to approve an ordinance to implement their recommended plan. The County Board will take the matter up at the regular County Board meeting or a special meeting in September.

2. 03R7 Public Hearing to receive comments relating to redistricting.

Comments by individuals are noted under Item 1 above.

This meeting was recorded on tape, which is available for audit upon prior request of the Committee Clerk. Any written documents submitted may be reviewed upon request of the Committee Clerk. The official copy of these minutes is available in the County Board office.

Adjourned: 12:10 p.m.

Linda

Linda Durham, Committee Clerk

Scheduled Items (Continued):